Application. Ser. No.: 10/686,986 (Atty. Docket No.: 004770.00147)

Response dated March 4, 2009 Reply to the Office Action of December 24, 2008

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed December 24, 2008, has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-12, 14-18, 22-36, and 38-40 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

## Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12, 14-18, 22-36, and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 6,199,048 to Hudetz et al. ("Hudetz"). This rejection is traversed below.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other features, "receiving information from a product tag in response to scanning the product tag with radiation, the received information including encoded text segments."

The Office Action at page 3 contends that the Abstract of Hudetz discloses the abovenoted features recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. More specifically, Hudetz
fails to describe features related to (encoded) text segments being included in received
information from a (scanned) product tag. Instead, Hudetz at col. 6, lines 8-27 and Figure 3
describes a symbol 46 corresponding to a standard UPC bar code as assigned by the Uniform
Code Council, Inc.. Symbol 46 encodes a ten-digit number (a product identification number).
As shown in Figure 3 and as described at col. 6, lines 8-27 of Hudetz, the product identification
number encoded in UPC symbol 46 consists of two five-digit fields, A and B, where field A is a
unique, pre-assigned number signifying a particular manufacturer and field B is a number
identifying one of the manufacturer's products. As such, Hudetz fails to describe features related
to receiving information from a product tag in response to scanning the product tag with
radiation, the received information including encoded text segments. Thus, claim 1 is allowable
for at least the foregoing reasons.

Additionally, claim 1 recites "... converting the received information to obtain the text segments, the text segments including a first text segment and a separate meta tag having one of one or more associated values. each of the associated values corresponding to a different rule...

Application. Ser. No.: 10/686,986 (Atty. Docket No.: 004770.00147)

Response dated March 4, 2009 Reply to the Office Action of December 24, 2008

. displaying the first text segment in a manner determined by the rule corresponding to the one associated value."

Contrary to the contentions in the Office Action at page 3, Hudetz fails to describe the above-noted features related to displaying a first text segment in a manner determined by a rule corresponding to an associated value. Instead, Hudetz at col. 7, lines 1-42 and Figure 4 describes a database (60) maintained by a service provider (22) wherein a mapping occurs between the five-digit fields A and B of Figure 3 (represented as fields 70 and 72 in Figure 4) and specific URLs (74) and narrative product descriptions (76). As described in Hudetz at col. 9, lines 5-12 and Figure 6, when receiving a UPC code as an input, database (60) maps the received code to a specific URL and product description so as to display the specific URL and product description on a display screen (94). The maintenance of a mapping between five-digit fields A and B and the URLs and product descriptions in the Hudetz database fails to describe features related to displaying a first text segment in a manner determined by a rule corresponding to an associated value as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Independent claims 22 and 25 recite features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. As such, claims 22 and 25 are allowable for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims

## Application. Ser. No.: 10/686,986

(Atty. Docket No.: 004770.00147)
Response dated March 4, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of December 24, 2008

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and request notice of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: March 4, 2009 By: /Mark E. Wilinski/

Mark E. Wilinski, Registration No. 63,230

1100 13th Street, N.W.

BANNER & WITCOFF, Ltd.

1100 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 1200

Washington, D.C. 20005-4051 Telephone: (202) 824-3000 Facsimile: (202) 824-3001